REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in light of the amendments and the following

remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully note that an Information Disclosure Statement, accompanied

by PTO Form 1449, was filed on March 15, 2002. A Photocopy of the IDS and its certificate of

mailing, the accompanying PTO Form 1449, the cited Japanese language documents, and their

partial English translation are included in Attachment A. Applicants note that the Office Action

dated March 25, 2005 does not include a copy of the PTO Form initialed by the Examiner and,

therefore, requests that the Examiner review the cited references and initial the PTO Form so that

the references are made of record and identified on the face of any patent which may issue from

this application.

The photocopies of the IDS submissions and other documentation in Attachment A

demonstrates that the references cited in the IDS were properly in the case at the time of the

Examiner's action. However, there is no indication that the Examiner considered these

references when formulating the first examination of the claims on the merits as required by 37

C.F.R. § 1.104(b). Should the Examiner fail to allow all of the claims over these references, as

currently urged by the Applicants, the Examiner is requested to issue a non-final Office Action

should a rejection be premised on any of the references in the IDS.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-21 are pending. Claims 1-21 have been amended. No new matter has been

added.

Serial No. 10/016,676

Page 13

Amendments to claims 1-21 were made to more distinctly claim the subject matter recited therein, and are of an idiomatic nature. Therefore, there is no narrowing of the subject matter contained therein.

Status of the Specification

The Examiner has reminded the Applicants of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure. Although Applicants believe that the Abstract, as filed, was in conformance with U.S. patent practice, Applicants have amended the Abstract by placing it in better idiomatic English.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 4 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. The Examiner contends that the claims are "literal translation into English from a foreign document." (Detailed Action, page 2, item 4.) Specifically, the Examiner contends that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the feature "the state" in line 7 of claim 4, and the feature "it" in line 24 of claim 6.

Claims 1-21 have been amended, and Applicants submit that the claims are in conformance with 35 U.S.C. § 112. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,24,707 to Humpleman et al. ("Humpleman") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,473,788 to Kim et al. ("Kim").

Serial No. 10/016,676 Page 14

The Examiner contends that Humpleman discloses a method and system for commanding and controlling a home appliance network. However, the Examiner acknowledges that Humpleman does not disclose sending "identification to server and receiving service menu from server" (Detailed Action, item 9, page 4.) The Examiner cites Kim as disclosing those features of the claimed invention missing from Humpleman, and contends that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Humpleman and Kim to achieve the invention of claims 1-21.

The Examiner has not cited one feature of the claims as being disclosed in Humpleman. Rather all the features are allegedly disclosed by Kim, and Humpleman merely discloses commanding and controlling appliances over a home appliance network. Additionally, the Examiner has not accurately characterized the passages in Kim relied on as disclosing the present invention.

In particular, Kim fails to disclose: (1) a server that receives identifier information specifying the appliance from the appliance; (2) that the identifier information that is received is sent by a telecommunications unit connected to the network, and disposed in the appliance; (3) that the identifier information is sent in response to a send instruction; and (4) that a menu of provider responses is sent to a display unit on the appliance. Further, although Kim discloses that the remote service organization obtains information from a peripheral device, Kim does not disclose an appliance requiring service information from the server of the provider, as is disclosed and claimed in the present application. Kim also does not disclose that the server sends a menu of collecting methods for repair work to the appliance display unit, nor does Kim disclose that the menu includes at least one of a telephone request, a repair request, an operation

Serial No. 10/016,676 Page 15

method, and another menu. Additionally, Kim does not disclose a customer information

database, as recited in the claims.

Applicants submit that these claimed features are missing from Humpleman and

Kim. Thus, Humpleman and Kim neither discloses nor suggest, singly or in combination, the

invention of claims 1-21. Therefore, the Examiner has failed to meet the burden of establishing a

prima facie case of obviousness over claims 1-21.

Reconsideration and withdrawal is requested.

Serial No. 10/016,676 Page 16

CONCLUSION

Each and every point raised in the Office Action mailed March 25, 2005 has been addressed on the basis of the above amendments and remarks. In view of the foregoing it is believed that claims 1-21 are in condition for allowance and it is respectfully requested that the application be reconsidered and that all pending claims be allowed and the case passed to issue.

If there are any other issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 14, 2005

Richard J. Katz

Reg. No. 47,698

Attorney for Applicants

DARBY & DARBY,. P.C. Post Office Box 5257

New York, N.Y. 10150-5257

Phone: (212) 527-7700